

1 consideration. That doesn't mean that 30 second messages
2 aren't good things or minute messages but they shouldn't be
3 the core requirement because kids don't like to watch half
4 hour programs. They should be on between 7 and 10 p.m. The -
5 - Scratch which got an award from the NAB is a teenage
6 program, was on at 5 or 6 in the morning. How many teenagers
7 do you know that set alarms to watch issue related programming
8 at that hour? No wonder the program went off the air because
9 it didn't get an audience. They should have to say which
10 target audience generally they're servicing. Very rarely is a
11 program that's good for pre-schoolers terrific for teenagers
12 except as a nostalgia issue. So, you have pre-school, school
13 age, from 6 to 11, and teenage programming. Like the book
14 business thinks about tubes, that's one of the reasons the
15 ratings game doesn't work because if you're really -- you're
16 going to say something meaningful to kids, you're not going to
17 reach the largest part of the child audience.

18 And each station shall provide a description of the
19 educational goal for the program. That's the process. And,
20 and I, I think that's been very nicely spelled out by people
21 in the earlier panel with, with how the program's designed to
22 meet this goal and an evaluation and that you should encourage
23 this information to be made broadly available per program to
24 the press the listings, to schools and parents. And in the
25 license renewal they should have to list every preemption of

1 the programs they're listing because Beakman's World, for
2 example, was very hard to see on the west coast all winter.

3 It's clear that everyone is trying to figure out how
4 to benefit from children, and I don't have -- I wouldn't like
5 to bet my vineyard house on whether this hearing is going to
6 cause broadcasters to all of a sudden do much better than
7 they've done for the last 12 years. So, I'd like to suggest
8 an alternative.

9 That the FCC should initiate the necessary steps to
10 relieve broadcasters of their public service obligation to
11 children and instead charge the industry a very small
12 percentage of its revenues. That money should be allocated to
13 public broadcasting to add to the monies used for children's
14 programming. And the nice point is that the FCC doesn't have
15 to ask you questions about -- the PBS doesn't have to ask what
16 that means. That if it's something less than one-half of 1
17 percent, it's \$100 million a year, and it should be an
18 industry-wide policy, not a choice per station because it
19 won't work if four stations give them a little money.

20 And I'll, I'll leave my last wonderful comments for
21 you to read since the red light came on.

22 MS. ELLERBEE: Thank you. Our next panelist is
23 Millicent Green. Millicent is a correspondent for Children's
24 Express, a journalism organization for children.

25 MS. GREEN: Good morning. My name is Millicent

1 Green, and I have just completed the seventh grade at St.
2 Francis Xavier Catholic School in Washington, D.C. And I'm
3 also a reporter for Children's Express, a national non-profit
4 youth development and leadership organization which uses oral
5 journalism to give children a significant voice in the world.

6 Children's Express is a news service researched,
7 reported and edited by children and teenagers who are ages 8
8 to 18, for audiences of all ages. Headquarters in Washington,
9 D.C. CE operates news rails in New York, Washington, D.C.
10 Indianapolis, Oakland and Marquette, Michigan. CE produces a
11 weekly column that is sent over the wire services to
12 newspapers across the country. CE was nominated for a
13 Pulitzer Prize in 1982 and in 1988 received a George Foster
14 Peabody Award and an Emmy Award for its coverage on the 1988
15 Presidential campaign. CE has also published five books in
16 October of 1993. I participated in CE's national hearings on
17 violence in child's lives at home, in the school, on the
18 streets.

19 I have been asked today to talk about children's
20 programming. Children's programs should be educational, fun,
21 and interesting because children will enjoy themselves and at
22 the same time learn new and educational things. The shows,
23 Not Just News and National Geographic, are educational, fun
24 and interesting. I like Not Just News because it talks about
25 the things that happen around the world in a language that I

1 can understand.

2 I like National Geographic because it talks about
3 the animals around the world. It shows animals in the action
4 of their natural habitat.

5 There are not enough educational and informational
6 programs on television. I want to see more shows like
7 Ghostwriter which gives children clues to solve mysteries. It
8 also teaches children how to deal with the different
9 situations such as drug abuse. I know I'd watch good
10 educational shows if they were on television. I believe that
11 many other children would watch such shows.

12 Some of the programs that children watch are not all
13 necessarily children's programs. The programs are for adults
14 but are shown at the times which children are watching. Some
15 of these programs are highly overrated. These programs cause
16 racial, religious, appearance and gender stereotypes to be
17 formed in children's minds.

18 When I watch Married With Children, I see Kelly as a
19 dumb -- as a young girl who is stereotyped as a dumb, blond-
20 haired, blue eyed female. I'd rather see something that is
21 more realistic.

22 Some children would rather choose an inappropriate
23 program over an educational program because children like to
24 be entertained. Inappropriate programs often entertain
25 children with violence. I think this is a form of

1 entertainment, can influence children, violence -- can
2 influence violence and children's lives.

3 When the younger children that I baby sit watch
4 cartoons such as Teenage Mutant Ninja Turtles, they watch --
5 they want to imitate the characters in the programs. They
6 make karate movements and sounds like the turtles.

7 I want the television networks to put on more
8 children's programs that are educational, entertaining, on for
9 a greater amount of time. I want to be able to turn on the
10 television no matter what time it is and find a program made
11 especially for children.

12 In my -- in closing, I'd like to say that television
13 is like food, you have to eat it in moderation. Children's
14 television programs can be a good educational tool. On the
15 other hand, bad television is like junk food, too much of it
16 is addictive.

17 MS. ELLERBEE: Thank you. Our next panelist is Dr.
18 Richard McCartney, Chairman of the Interfaith Broadcasting
19 Commission.

20 DR. McCARTNEY: The Interfaith Broadcasting
21 Commission is a consortium composed of the National Council of
22 Churches of Christ in the USA, the New York Board of Rabbis,
23 the United States Catholic Conference and the Southern Baptist
24 Radio and Television Commission. Together, these groups
25 represent 100,000,000 Judeo-Christian adherents and have been

1 involved, many of them, in the production and promotion of
2 radio and television programs for more than 40 years.

3 IBC members share a particular concern for the well
4 being of children a desire to see educational and
5 informational programming for children become reality.

6 Since most children by the time they complete high
7 school will spend more time watching television than in the
8 classroom, we had hoped that passage of the Children's
9 Television Act would result in significant gains in both the
10 quantity and quality of children's programming on broadcast
11 television. We're disappointed to note that this has not
12 happened.

13 What is available to children is the same violence
14 filled cartoons and program length toy commercials that
15 existed prior to passage of the Act. Even though the law
16 placed a special obligation on broadcasters to meet the
17 educational and informational needs of children, it appears
18 that the only part of the Act to inspire much compliance is
19 the limit on the number of commercial minutes since it's
20 fairly simple to measure the number and length of commercial
21 breaks within a program. It seems that the need now is to
22 make the other requirements of the Act simple to understand
23 and measure.

24 We believe the Commission should establish a clear
25 definition of what is meant by the Act's language,

1 informational and educational programming for children. We
2 further recommend that the programs be specifically designed
3 to meet the unique needs of children in various stages of
4 development instead of being targeted primarily to those
5 children old enough to influence buying decisions.

6 To be credited by the Commission as serving the
7 educational and informational needs of children, programming
8 should be created expressly for children and have as one of
9 its primary purposes to contribute to the positive growth of
10 the child's cognitive/intellectual and/or social/emotional
11 needs.

12 The educational and informational children's
13 programs should be aired during hours children are likely to
14 be in the viewing audience. For example, early morning and
15 after school. A minimum of 1 hour of standard length
16 educational and informational children's programming should be
17 required each day since a requirement would involve only about
18 4 percent of the broadcast week for a full-time station.

19 Programming should be specific to children at
20 various stages of development for the needs of pre-school
21 children are not the same as those for elementary, pre-teen
22 and early teenagers. It should be made clear that programs
23 designed for children may and, in fact, should include moral
24 and religious values. The experience of IBC members and
25 others has been that broadcasters generally shy away from

1 programs which teach values for fear of offending or breaking
2 some unwritten rule forbidding such teaching. Programs such
3 as Our Friends on Wooster Square, Davey and Goliath, Sunshine
4 Factory and Story Barn are examples of programs produced by
5 groups related to IBC which are entertaining and also teach
6 values in ways children can understand and accept. They're
7 religiously based but are designed to teach positive value and
8 not dogma.

9 The obligations of licensees under the Act should be
10 clearly spelled out. These rules should include numerical
11 goals and mandates which will be used to measure performance
12 at renewal time. Numerical goals are essential to successful
13 enforcement by an agency which has a small staff to allocate
14 for enforcement yet is charged with policing and industry that
15 apparently has every economic incentive not to comply with the
16 law. We note that the Commission has successfully relied upon
17 statistical evidence and guidelines in its enforcement of its
18 Equal Employment Opportunity rules.

19 Non-compliance with FCC rules regarding children's
20 television programming must be considered seriously in the
21 Commission's review of applications for license renewals.
22 Failure to comply with the Act should result in denial of
23 license renewal.

24 Questional records of compliance should result in
25 hearings to determine fitness for renewal. Minimal compliance

1 should result in a shortened license period with reporting
2 requirements. Reliance on licensees to define what
3 constitutes appropriate children's programming clearly has
4 failed. The Commission must act decisively to insure that the
5 intent of Congress is not frustrated and the public trust is
6 not violated. Clear regulation and strong enforcement are the
7 means available to the Commission to salvage the good
8 intentions of the Children's Television Act.

9 Thank you.

10 MS. ELLERBEE: Thank you very much. Our next
11 panelist is Charlene Uhl. Miss Uhl -- sorry -- Charlene Uhl,
12 Campaign Director for Maryland Campaign for Kid's T.V.

13 MS. UHL: Thank you. Mr. Chairman, Commission
14 members. The Maryland Campaign for Kid's T.V. was started
15 about 2 years ago with two goals; one, to assure compliance
16 with the Children's Television Act but, two, to help educate
17 parents, teachers and others who work with children on how to
18 develop critical viewing skills for children because there are
19 many things on television that were never intended for
20 children.

21 And one of the things we produce and I know you have
22 a copy is When Pulling the Plug Isn't Enough. We don't
23 advocate turning the T.V. off but we do advocate parental
24 involvement.

25 We've been monitoring the Maryland and Washington,

1 D.C. stations for 2 years and in our first year the community
2 teams made up of people living in the community were very
3 disappointed to deliver the first report card. The overall
4 grade was a D+. I guess that's different than Boston because
5 in Maryland parents, teachers and kids who are on these teams
6 were not satisfied with the quality, the amount of timing that
7 it was on, the station interest in participating, although
8 that was their highest grade, they got a B- on that, and the
9 programming for different ages.

10 We're going to be releasing our second year's report
11 card next month on July 21st. And I -- we don't know yet
12 because the teams are still formulating their final grades if
13 there's going to be some change but I can answer one question
14 Commissioner Chong had and that relates to what makes a
15 difference. Community involvement makes a difference. One
16 station that had no children's programming on last year added
17 four half-hour programs on and they wrote to me and said it
18 was in direct response to the Children's Television Act and
19 the community activism around that Act.

20 Out of all that, broadcasters have said, well, wait,
21 you know, this yellow document. How did you grade us? We
22 don't know what means compliance with the Children's
23 Television Act. And because the FCC and the regulations are
24 so ambiguous, we had to develop our own score sheet which
25 we've sent out to the broadcasters and we use. And I just

1 distributed this to you, to give them some ideas in Maryland
2 what we believe is compliance with the Children's Television
3 Act. And that's incorporated really in three major
4 recommendations we're making to you today.

5 First, that 1 hour a day be required for educational
6 and informational programming. Last year we found across the
7 Maryland stations an hour and a half was the average time.
8 Out of 112 hours a week that we monitored, an hour and a half
9 of educational informational programming identified by the
10 stations as such was all. That's a little more than 1 percent
11 of air time for the children in Maryland.

12 Secondly, that it is aired that programming at times
13 when children are likely to watch and it's maintained in a
14 regular time slot. Parents found over and over again in
15 trying to guide their children's viewing habits, they couldn't
16 count on those programs being in the same time. They were
17 often preempted.

18 And, third, that it be standard length programming,
19 as Peggy said, half hour programming. Talking with some of
20 the kids here and some of the kids that have been on our
21 teams, they find it very demeaning to be told by stations,
22 well, a 30 second or a 60 second is about the length of your
23 attention span. They were offended by that. And when they
24 see good programming and we have done a lot of viewing where
25 kids come and watch programming, they are absolutely entranced

1 by it. And it's educational and it is informational.

2 Thank you very much.

3 MS. ELLERBEE: Thank you. Our next panelist is
4 Bruce Johansen, President of the National Association of
5 Television Program Executives.

6 MR. JOHANSEN: Chairman Hundt, Commissioners, thank
7 you for affording me the opportunity to speak with you today
8 about the important issue of children's television.

9 I do so on behalf of NATPE's 2,000+ corporate
10 members and more than 13,000 attendees from every corner of
11 the globe who will participate in NATPE's annual software
12 marketplace next January in Las Vegas.

13 NATPEs diverse members who are also concerned
14 parents, are highly sensitive to what affects children in our
15 society. In fact, the U.S. industries we represent,
16 television programmers, broadcasters, cable casters,
17 independent producers, studios, syndicators, have over the
18 years been creative and tenacious champions of television for
19 young viewers and their families.

20 This programming grew out of a largely flexible,
21 enlightened regulatory environment where stifling content and
22 quantitative regulations were not acceptable intrusions into
23 the rich and diverse creative process that has made our
24 industry the envy of the world. In recognizing that we have
25 tremendous challenges and significant problems in our society

1 today, the answer is not to indict television. Television is
2 simply not the root cause of all evil in our society and to
3 blame it and at the same time expect it to solve all of
4 society's problems is to deny reality. Moreover, to burden
5 our rich creative process with straitjacket regulations will
6 surely inhibit an industry that can be an important tool in
7 the rejuvenation of our troubled society, particularly among
8 young viewers.

9 Now, let's talk about some concrete things that our
10 industry can do and is doing to use our exciting medium to
11 affirmatively influence young viewers. Several years ago,
12 NATPE's Board of Directors was troubled by the increased
13 incidents of bigotry in our society, and implemented an award-
14 winning national public service campaign that featured
15 animated public service spots for young viewers.

16 Just last week -- actually, a week ago today,
17 NATPE's Educational Foundation sponsored a teleconferencing
18 workshop to address ways to reduce violence on television.
19 Broadcasters participating in the satellite interactive
20 teleworkshop discussed how they are voluntarily limiting the
21 use of news footage of violent scenes during late afternoon
22 and early evening local news shows in order to diminish the
23 opportunity for young viewers to see gross scenes of violence.
24 Other ideas were shared among the NATPE panelists, which
25 included Oscar and Emmy award winning producer, Arnold

1 Shapiro. Mr. Shapiro's most recent success, Kids Killing
2 Kids, demonstrated in a compelling manner how young people can
3 diffuse potentially violent situations.

4 We are also conducting a survey in conjunction with
5 professional researchers from the University of California at
6 Santa Barbara to poll youngsters from the ages of 8 through 14
7 as to what they think are the sources of violence in their
8 lives and simultaneously ascertain what television programs
9 they're watching and why they watch what they do. NATPE will
10 also hold town hall meetings in several cities where children
11 and young people, rather than adults, will discuss their views
12 on violence. We feel strongly that the nation's children and
13 young people have been the unheard voices in this continuing
14 debate over the roots of violence in society.

15 Some critics claim that there have been virtually no
16 innovative or educational programs developed for children
17 since the Children's Television Act was introduced. This is
18 simply not true. One has only to visit the NATPE Exhibit
19 Florida, see firsthand new programs offered in syndication
20 designed specifically with educational and prosocial messages
21 as their key underlining objectives.

22 Local broadcasters like Paul La Camera have
23 understood this for years. They have been at the forefront of
24 developing outstanding program for young people, programming
25 that is at once informative, educational and entertaining.

1 And you'll hear today in our hearing about award winning
2 children's programming successes produced by companies such as
3 Warners, Hearst, LIN, Class, Westinghouse, Reicher, Turner,
4 PBS, CPB, Columbia and Disney, not to mention ABC, NBC, CBS
5 and Fox.

6 The aforementioned examples of self-initiated
7 activity by NATPE's members are but a few of the endeavors
8 ongoing within our industry to provide more programming and
9 information that is constructive as well as entertaining for
10 young viewers. We think it's misguided to add more
11 regulations. We rather urge the Commission to serve as a
12 catalyst to further energize the vast melting pot of our rich
13 cultural and ethnic diversity.

14 In this regard, I would like to respectfully request
15 the Commission to consider two proposals. First, the
16 Commission should issue once a year commendations for
17 outstanding efforts in the children's television arena. This
18 would afford you an opportunity without content regulation to
19 recognize creative efforts and inspire quality children's
20 television that reflects the spirit and intent of the
21 Children's Television Act.

22 And, second, I urge the Commission to consider
23 convening semi-annual meetings where producers, broadcasters,
24 cable casters, educators, and public interest groups could
25 come together for an ongoing discussion with Commission

1 involvement on the evolving nature of children's television.
2 NATPE would be proud to assist in organizing both of the above
3 suggestions.

4 Thank you.

5 MS. ELLERBEE: Thank you. My final panelist is
6 Squire Rushnell. He is President of Rushnell Communications
7 and Publishing and former Vice President of ABC Children's
8 Television.

9 MR. RUSHNELL: Thank you and good morning. My name
10 is Squire Rushnell, producer of children's and family
11 programming.

12 Today, however, I speak to you as the former Vice
13 President of Children's Television at ABC from 1973 to 1989.
14 And against this backdrop, I;d like to offer an historical
15 perspective of educational children's programming at the
16 commercial networks.

17 Now, in 1973 the garden of children's television was
18 somewhat overgrown with weeds. But there was hope because
19 action for Children's Television was making an awful lot of
20 progress. And ACT was supported by a succession of White
21 House administrations and FCCs whose unequivocal message to
22 broadcasters was that they must consider television for
23 children as a special responsibility.

24 Now, this clear message from the Nixon, Ford and
25 Carter administrations fostered what I called the positive

1 evolution in children's television. And the verification is a
2 study that my company conducted, evaluating two decades of
3 educational programming by the commercial networks.

4 Now, in 1975 the networks were presenting a combined
5 average of 9-3/4 hours a week of children's programs that were
6 specifically designed to be educational. By 1980, the
7 combined weekly average grew to 11 hours and a quarter.

8 Now, this high point in children's television
9 included ABC Afterschool Specials and NBC's Special Treats.
10 CBS's In the News explained concepts like solar energy. And
11 ABC's Schoolhouse Rock taught programs in math and science and
12 english and history.

13 You know, years later testing the efficacy of these
14 short-form 3 minute programs is easy. You can just ask any 25
15 or 30 year old, what's a conjunction? And the reply is likely
16 to be a Schoolhouse Rock song, conjunction junction, what's
17 your function, hooking up words and phrases and all kinds of
18 things. And if you ask those same people, well, how does a
19 bill go through Congress? And they'll simply sing from 1980,
20 I'm just a bill on Capital Hill.

21 Now, 1980 was also the year that the positive
22 evolution ground to a halt because there was a change here in
23 Washington. And while the FCC fostered deregulation,
24 President Reagan said, well, let's let the broadcasters do it
25 themselves.

1 And what did we broadcasters do? We undid the
2 positive evolution in children's television. In the absence
3 of an impetus from Washington, a clear message, my colleagues
4 and I just didn't notice that the weeds were growing back into
5 the garden throughout the '80s. And by 1990, the three
6 network combined weekly average went from 11¼ hours down to an
7 hour and 45 minutes a week, combined by the three networks.

8 Now, the study for '94-'95 shows that the three
9 original commercial networks will present a combined weekly
10 average of 5 and 3/4 hours of educational children's
11 programming starting this fall. And if you add Fox to that,
12 the weekly average among the four networks will be up to 9
13 hours. But that's not a bad start on recovery.

14 Now, my final point is this. Everybody agrees with
15 the power of television to teach. At the same time, most of
16 us have heard about how our children stack up against school
17 kids in other countries. The Educational Testing Service's
18 report among 15 nations ranks children of the United States
19 next to last in math and second from last in science.

20 But I wonder. Isn't it possible for us to employ
21 the power of television like we did with Schoolhouse Rock
22 remembered all these years later? Employ that power to tell
23 -- offset these deficits among children. Isn't it possible
24 for the FCC to form an advisory task force to serve as a
25 bridge between the Commission and broadcasters to encourage

1 voluntary action?

2 Is it possible for the FCC to offer incentives, such
3 as tax certificates to those who produce programs that serve
4 the specific educational needs of our children?

5 You know, in that ETS study of 15 nations, our
6 American kids did rank number one in one thing: the amount of
7 time they watch television. Now, I see that as an
8 opportunity, the opportunity for American television to help
9 teach our kids. And I pledge my services to help that in any
10 way I can.

11 Thank you.

12 MS. ELLERBEE: Thank you, panelists. Chairman
13 Hundt?

14 CHAIRMAN HUNDT: Mr. Rushnell, you seem to be able
15 to prove that you can be educational, entertaining,
16 interesting and informative all at the same time. Thank you
17 very much.

18 I want to say that I think that NATPE and NAB have
19 made many, many positive contributions to, to children and to
20 parents in their long histories and we're here not to
21 criticize but to learn. And I really appreciate the spirit in
22 which you, Bruce, and you, Paul, have offered your views. And
23 the, and the most interesting thing about this panel and the
24 previous panel to me is how much agreement there is about the
25 responsibility and role of T.V. And I think there are many

1 people here who have acted in their commercial lives with such
2 good faith and such caring that they deserve great
3 commendation.

4 I would like to ask you, Bruce, and you Paul, each,
5 to comment on this graft and let me be very specific. Do you
6 believe that Mr. Rushnell's graft is accurate? Paul, let me
7 ask you to respond first.

8 MR. LA CAMERA: Certainly, I wouldn't questions the
9 veracity of it. I mean I've known Squire since his ABC days
10 and have the highest regard for him as a broadcaster and
11 someone whose primary interests are in the welfare of
12 America's children.

13 What also occurred in those years, aside from a
14 philosophical change of government administration, was the
15 emergence of cable and the dispersion of the children's
16 television audience to, to alternative sources which included
17 cable and video. And I think, you know, some of that declined
18 in what the networks were offering maybe attributed to that as
19 well. On the other hand, I think we need to be encouraged by
20 the fact that there has been such a rapid increase in the, in
21 the few short years since the implementation of the Act.

22 CHAIRMAN HUNDT: So, you would say that one of the
23 principle factors accounting for the decline in, in the amount
24 of educational T.V. as shown in this graft between 1980 and
25 1990 was the emergence of cable but this cable, of course,

1 hasn't gone away since 1990, has even greater penetration --

2 MR. LA CAMERA: No.

3 CHAIRMAN HUNDT: -- since 1990? So, you're saying
4 that the, the offsetting factor since 1990 is the Children's
5 T.V. Act?

6 MR. LA CAMERA: Absolutely.

7 CHAIRMAN HUNDT: Since 1990?

8 MR. LA CAMERA: Again -- in, in 1980, for all
9 intents and purposes, traditional commercial television was an
10 oligopoly. That has been undermined by cable and other --

11 CHAIRMAN HUNDT: Okay.

12 MR. LA CAMERA: -- media sources. And as a result,
13 the children's television audience was dispersed. The
14 networks reacting both from the deregulated atmosphere and,
15 secondly, the commercial undermining of their ability to reach
16 children produced what Squire shared with us today.

17 CHAIRMAN HUNDT: Paul, --

18 MR. LA CAMERA: The Children's Television Act,
19 though, I think has more than begun making amends for that.

20 CHAIRMAN HUNDT: Paul, Miss Belter and the previous
21 panel, Miss Uhl and Dr. McCartney, have all asked that
22 broadcasters deliver 1 hour a day of requisite programming.
23 Putting aside for a moment the legitimate and serious concerns
24 over the definition, what do you think of that request?

25 MR. LA CAMERA: It's, it's a request that makes us

1 most uncomfortable. I mean to respond --

2 CHAIRMAN HUNDT: You'd be willing to expand on that
3 a little, explain why?

4 MR. LA CAMERA: To respond for us from a positive
5 perspective and that is that we sincerely believe that the Act
6 has produced measurable and meaningful improvements and it
7 doesn't mean that it's peaked. There's a way to go and I know
8 where -- no time ever suggest that we're at an ideal position
9 right now.

10 Secondly, whatever that arbitrary number might be is
11 going to degenerate into a numbers game, in the way we conduct
12 our television stations and in the way we report our
13 performance.

14 Whatever sense of idealism or public service
15 imperative that now guide so much in what we do I think will
16 evaporate.

17 Again, on a practical level, the, the minimum that,
18 that, that you determine and mandate will -- may very well
19 become the maximum for most broadcasters. And I don't know
20 quite what, what is served for that.

21 It's also -- for network affiliated stations like
22 ours, it's not a particularly practical, rational or
23 economically viable programming strategy.

24 And then, finally, I would suggest -- and, again,
25 this is best left to Constitutional lawyers, that, that

1 delicate and very important First Amendment line that
2 separates what you do as a government official and what I do
3 as a broadcaster would be abridged.

4 CHAIRMAN HUNDT: What would be an economically
5 viable number? You said it wouldn't be economically viable.
6 What would be an economically viable number?

7 MR. LA CAMERA: I, I don't know how to respond to
8 that, Mr. Chairman. As far as the economic -- there is no
9 magic number. It -- it's a matter of where you position this
10 programming. Children's programming on a classic network
11 affiliated station does not work and it's proven it doesn't
12 work economically during the week, Monday to Friday. And,
13 again, I make that statement not rooted with my mind in the
14 past but looking to what we have to be as a news and
15 information source of the future to survive as the
16 institutions that we are today.

17 CHAIRMAN HUNDT: Bruce, I wanted to ask you to
18 comment, too, but the red light is on so I'm --

19 MS. ELLERBEE: Mr. Chairman, you just feel free to
20 go right ahead if you want to ask him to comment.

21 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: You're the boss.

22 CHAIRMAN HUNDT: In fairness, I, you know, I would
23 like to let you comment as well.

24 MR. JOHANSEN: Thank you.

25 CHAIRMAN HUNDT: The same question. What did you

1 think of the --

2 MR. JOHANSEN: I would like, first of all, --

3 CHAIRMAN HUNDT: -- of their request for 1 hour was
4 the question?

5 MR. JOHANSEN: Well, may I first respond to the, to
6 the chart? And I certainly would never contradict any, any
7 data submitted by someone who sings as well as my comrade
8 here.

9 There's another factor and that is the syndication
10 marketplace which is an important part of our association and
11 the number of children's programs that have been offered in
12 syndication since that. It's not reflected, obviously,
13 because that's reflecting only network television. That's an
14 important factor. And also the diversity, certainly through
15 cable, would influence that. But there's another underlying
16 issue here. We talk about children's programs, programs
17 designed specifically for children and we, we overlook by
18 doing that. The fact that prime time programming,
19 particularly from the 8 to 9 p.m. window, includes programs,
20 sitcoms, that are offering directly what the Children's
21 Television Act requires and the prosocial messages, great
22 sources of information and educational information for young
23 people. It can never be reflected in a quantitative chart
24 like this.

25 CHAIRMAN HUNDT: And the other question?

1 MR. JOHANSEN: And the other question I, I echo what
2 Paul has said. I think the, the First Amendment spector is an
3 enormous one. And I think that what you then do is, is give
4 minimal, minimal requirements, to say you're sending a signal,
5 that this is really what you -- we expect you to do.

6 The broadcasters and programmers and creative people
7 are just like you. We're just real folks with kids.

8 CHAIRMAN HUNDT: I don't want to take -- I don't
9 want to take up too much time --

10 MR. JOHANSEN: And we're as concerned as well.

11 CHAIRMAN HUNDT: -- but I didn't ask about what we
12 should do. I just asked simply, what did you think of their
13 request. So, really, that wouldn't implicate the First
14 Amendment at all. You see what I'm saying? I'm just asking
15 what do you think of their request?

16 MR. JOHANSEN: I, I think it would be onerous.

17 CHAIRMAN HUNDT: Thanks.

18 MS. ELLERBEE: Commissioner Quello?

19 COMMISSIONER QUELLO: Well, we have a responsibility
20 of, you know, implementing educational informational programs
21 for television. And, and I mentioned before, it's, it's going
22 to be difficult to do without some kind of specifics. And I
23 usually find that if you have specifics that -- as a
24 guideline, it's easier to comply with from a broadcaster's
25 standpoint and easier to enforce from a Commission standpoint.